

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PAULA CARRIE ROGERS,

Plaintiff,

v.

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:24-cv-00475-TLN-CKD (PS)

ORDER

Proceeding pro se, plaintiff initiated this action on February 15, 2024, against Defendants County of Sacramento, Bobby Davis, Tina Durham, Tisha Smith, and City of Elk Grove. (ECF No. 1.) Defendants County of Sacramento, Bobby Davis, Tisha Smith, and City of Elk Grove have been dismissed from the case. (ECF Nos. 45, 50, 58, 62.) Defendant Tina Durham is the only remaining defendant in this case, and she has answered the complaint. (ECF No. 66.)

Accordingly, within 30 days from the date of this order, the parties shall meet, in person or by telephone, as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26. Within 7 days after the parties' Rule 26 meeting, the parties shall file a Joint Status Report¹ for the purpose of the court's entry of a pretrial scheduling order. The joint status report shall address the relevant portions of

¹ If the parties are unable to file a joint status report, they may file separate status reports.

Local Rule 240(a).

In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows:

1. Within 30 days from the date of this order, the parties shall meet, in person or by telephone, as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26.

2. Within 7 days after the parties' Rule 26 discussion, the parties shall file a joint status report and request for hearing before the Magistrate Judge for the purpose of entry of a pretrial scheduling order. The report shall address the following matters:

- a. Service of process;
- b. Possible joinder of additional parties;
- c. Any expected or desired amendment of the pleadings;
- d. Jurisdiction and venue;
- e. Anticipated motions and their scheduling;
- f. The report required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26 outlining the proposed discovery plan and its scheduling, including disclosure of expert witnesses;
- g. Future proceedings, including setting appropriate cut-off dates for discovery and law and motion, and the scheduling of a pretrial conference and trial;
- h. Special procedures, if any;
- i. Estimated trial time;
- j. Modification of standard pretrial procedures specified by the rules due to the simplicity or complexity of the proceedings;
- k. Whether the case is related to any other cases, including bankruptcy;
- l. Whether a settlement conference should be scheduled before another Magistrate Judge;
- m. The parties' positions with respect to Voluntary Dispute Resolution (VDRP) under Local Rule 271(d); and


////

////

////

1 n. Any other matters that may add to the just and expeditious disposition of this
2 matter.

3 Dated: October 10, 2025

4 
CAROLYN K. DELANEY
5 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

6 5, roge.0475.24
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28